



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,785	04/18/2001	Young Francis Day	2000P09095 US01	9919

7590 09/16/2005
Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

NGUYEN BA, PAUL H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/837,785

Applicant(s)

DAY ET AL.

Examiner

Paul Nguyen-Ba

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-14,19-24 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-14, 19-24, and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/29/2005 has been entered.

2. Claims 1, 3-14, 19-24, and 26 are currently pending. Claims 1, 19, 22, and 24 are independent claims.

Priority

3. This application claims benefit under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) of provisional patent application 60/259,610, filed on December 18, 2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2176

5. Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-20, 22-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaharkin, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147747, in view of Wang et al. ("Wang"), U.S. Patent No. 6,822,663, in further view of Sorge et al. ("Sorge"), U.S. Patent No. 6,613,098.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 22 and dependent claim 3, Zaharkin teaches:

A system for transforming (i.e. converting) a document from a first format to a different second format, said document being encoded in a language including presentation style determination attributes (see pg.1 - [0002]), comprising:

a source of [conversion] parameters determining a desired [format] of an output document (pg. 2 – [0026] → includes a configuration file that is received by the disambiguator which specifies predetermined parameters describing how the disambiguation process operates);

an input document processor for [converting] a received input document in a first format (pg. 2 – [0025] → receives document of ambiguated and/or ambiguous data) by parsing said input document and collating elements of said input document into a hierarchically ordered structure representing an intermediate document structure (pg. 2 – [0025]; pg. 3 – [0034], [0036], [0037]; pg. 4, [0057] → system includes a mapper that receives a document. The mapper creates a mapping file from the document); and

a [conversion] processor for [converting] said intermediate document structure into an output document with said desired... format in response to said [conversion] parameters (pg. 2 – [0025]; pg. 4 – [0055] → The disambiguator receives the mapping file and the document type definition (DTD). The disambiguator converts the mapping file into an output file that complies with the DTD and/or disambiguates the mapping file in reference to, or based on, the DTD).

Zaharkin does not specifically teach:

...transformation parameters determining a desired presentation style and content structure.

However, Wang teaches:

...transformation parameters determining a desired presentation style and content structure (see Abstract; col. 8 lines 7-25).

Since Zaharkin and Wang are both from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Wang would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Zaharkin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Zaharkin with the teachings of Wang to include:

transformation parameters determining a desired presentation style and content structure

for the motivational purpose of transforming existing web pages for display in multiple internet appliances such as computers, mobile phones, PDAs, television set-top boxes, and the like (see col. 1 lines 14-18).

Zaharkin, in view of Wang, do not specifically teach:

...including a preprocessor for resolving conflicts arising due to said transformation parameters in accordance with predetermined conflict resolution rules...in accordance with said conflict resolution rules; and

a preprocessor for correcting errors in at least one of: (a) said input document, and (b) said transformation parameters.

However, Sorge teaches:

A processor for recognizing and resolving conflicts and correcting errors due to conversion parameters (see col. 12, lines 35-67 to col. 13, lines 1-34) for the purpose of converting a document structure into an output document that is in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

Since Zaharkin, Wang, and Sorge are all from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Sorge would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Zaharkin/Wang. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Zaharkin/Wang with the teachings of Sorge to include a preprocessor for recognizing and resolving conflicts and errors due to transformation parameters for the purpose of transforming a document structure into an output document that is in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

Regarding claim 4, Zaharkin further teaches:

a system including a filter for excluding undesired information from said output documents (pg. 3 – [0039] → a path is filtered if it is not acceptable to the DTD with tag inference in reference to, or based on, the rules of the markup language of the DTD, such as SGML).

Regarding claim 5, Zaharkin further teaches:

a sorting processor...output document (pg. 1 – [0008] → mapping file having one node representing each possible mapping of an element of the DTD to a portion of the document).

Regarding claim 6, Zaharkin further teaches:

a system wherein said input documents and said output documents are different...multimedia file (pg. 1 – [0002]; pg. 4 – [0046] → i.e. SGML converted into XML or vice versa).

Regarding claim 7, Zaharkin further teaches:

...parameters identifying input document type and output documents type (pg. 2 – [0026] → System includes a configuration file that is received by the

disambiguator which specifies predetermined settings and/or parameters describing how the disambiguation process of the disambiguator operate. For example, one setting and/or parameter that specifies the markup syntax of the DTD and the output file, such as Extensible Markup Language (XML) and/or Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML)).

Regarding claim 8, Zaharkin further teaches:

a system wherein *said source of transformation parameters comprises an SGML document* (pg. 1 – [004]; pg. 4 – [0046]).

Regarding claim 9, Zaharkin further teaches:

...wherein said transformation processor transforms said intermediate document structure into said output document...by performing at least one of...reordering operation...document structure (pg. 3 – [0037]; pg. 4 – [0056] → DTD **reorders** by declaring where each tag is allowed and which tags can appear within other tags).

Regarding claim 11, Zaharkin further teaches:

...wherein said transformation parameters include transformation rules...into said output documents (pg. 2 – [0026] → System includes a configuration file that is received by the disambiguator which specifies predetermined settings and/or parameters describing how the disambiguation process of the disambiguator operate. For example, one setting and/or parameter that specifies the markup syntax of the DTD and the output file, such as Extensible Markup Language (XML) and/or Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML)).

Regarding claim 12, Zaharkin further teaches:

...wherein said transformation rules map elements...hierarchical tree structure...output documents (pg. 2 – [0025]; pg. 3 – [0034]-[0037] → elements are mapped into a hierarchical tree structure of the DTD).

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding claim 13, Zaharkin further teaches:

a system including a management processor for determining said transformation parameters...desired presentation style (pg. 2 – [0026] → i.e. disambiguator).

Regarding independent claim 19, Zaharkin teaches the system with respect to independent claim 1 as discussed above.

Zaharkin does not specifically teach:

a management processor (a) for receiving user-provided input data selecting a second format from a plurality of selectable formats for presentation on a display device, and for receiving user-provided transformation parameters determining a desired presentation layout.

However, Wang teaches:

a management processor (a) for receiving user-provided input data selecting a second format from a plurality of selectable formats for presentation on a display device (see col. 11 lines 20-59), and (b) for receiving user-provided transformation parameters determining a desired presentation layout (see col. 11 lines 20-59; see also col. 8 lines 9-25).

Since Zaharkin and Wang are both from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Wang would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Zaharkin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Zaharkin with the teachings of Wang to include:

a management processor (a) for receiving user-provided input data selecting a second format from a plurality of selectable formats for presentation on a display device (see col. 11 lines 20-59), and (b) for receiving user-provided transformation parameters determining a desired presentation layout (see col. 11 lines 20-59; see also col. 8 lines 9-25)

Art Unit: 2176

for the motivational purpose of transforming existing web pages for display in multiple internet appliances such as computers, mobile phones, PDAs, television set-top boxes, and the like (see col. 1 lines 14-18).

Regarding Claim 20, Zaharkin teaches:

...said second format for presentation on at least one display device from, (a) a mobile or non-mobile phone, (b) a personal data assistant device, (c) a PC, (d) a TV (e) another processing device (see pg 2 – [0019]-[0024] → i.e. computer monitor).

Regarding claim 23, Zaharkin teaches a method for transforming a document from a first format to a different second format with respect to independent claim 22 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach:

transforming said intermediate document structure (i.e. mapping file) into said output document by, *Adopting...allocating content...determined display page style.*

However, Zaharkin teaches:

the use of DTD document and mapping file to define the rules and format of the document in terms of a set of declarations for a markup language (pg. 2 – [0025], [0026] → i.e. DTD) for the purpose of transforming a document from a first format to a different second format.

It was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art to use style sheets (XSL, XSLT, CSS, etc.) for the purpose of adopting said desired presentation style determining a display page layout and allocating content of said intermediate documents structure in accordance with determined display page style.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a style sheet in the art of Zaharkin for the purpose of adopting said desired presentation style determining a display page layout and allocating content of said intermediate documents structure in accordance with determined display page style.

Regarding independent claim 24, Zaharkin teaches:

A method for converting a document from a first format to a different second format, said document being encoded in a language including presentation layout determination attributes (see pg.1 - [0002]), comprising the steps of:

receiving a user-provided input document in a first format (see pg. 2 - [0025]);

processing the received input document in the first format (pg. 2 - [0025] → receives document of ambiguated and/or ambiguous data) by parsing said input document and collating elements of said input document into a hierarchically ordered structure representing an intermediate document structure (pg. 2 - [0025]; pg. 3 - [0034], [0036], [0037]; pg. 4, [0057] → system includes a mapper that receives a document. The mapper creates a mapping file from the document); and

converting said intermediate document structure into the output document of the second format, the output document with said desired presentation layout and content structure corresponding to said template document and said transformation parameters (pg. 2 - [0025]; pg. 4 - [0055] → The disambiguator receives the mapping file and the document type definition (DTD). The disambiguator converts the mapping file into an output file that complies with the DTD and/or disambiguates the mapping file in reference to, or based on, the DTD).

Zaharkin does not specifically teach:

receiving a user-selected second format from a plurality of selectable formats;

receiving a user-selected template document from a plurality of selectable template documents;

receiving user-provided transformation parameters corresponding to the template document, the transformation parameters determining a desired presentation layout and content structure.

However, Wang teaches:

receiving a user-selected second format from a plurality of selectable formats (see col. 11 lines 20-59);

receiving a user-selected template document from a plurality of selectable template documents (see col. 11 lines 20-59);

receiving user-provided transformation parameters corresponding to the template document, the transformation parameters determining a desired presentation layout and content structure (see col. 8 lines 15-25).

Since Zaharkin and Wang are both from the same field of endeavor, the purposes disclosed by Wang would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Zaharkin. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Zaharkin with the teachings of Wang for the motivational purpose of transforming existing web pages for display in multiple internet appliances such as computers, mobile phones, PDAs, television set-top boxes, and the like (see Wang - col. 1 lines 14-18).

Regarding Claim 26, Zaharkin further teaches:

a method wherein said converting step includes applying transformation rules mapping elements...output element (pg. 2 – [0025]; pg. 4 – [0055] → The disambiguator receives the mapping file and the document type definition (DTD). The disambiguator converts the mapping file into an output file that complies with the DTD and/or disambiguates the mapping file in reference to, or based on, the DTD).

Art Unit: 2176

6. Claims 10, 14, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaharkin, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147747.

Regarding claim 10, Zaharkin teaches a system for transforming a document from a first format to a different second format with respect to independent claim 1 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach:

transforming said intermediate document structure (i.e. mapping file) into said output document by, *adopting...allocating content...determined display page style*.

However, Zaharkin teaches:

the use of DTD document and mapping file to define the rules and format of the document in terms of a set of declarations for a markup language (pg. 2 – [0025], [0026] → i.e. DTD) for the purpose of transforming a document from a first format to a different second format.

It was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art to use style sheets (XSL, XSLT, CSS, etc.) for the purpose of adopting said desired presentation style determining a display page layout and allocating content of said intermediate documents structure in accordance with determined display page style.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a style sheet in the art of Zaharkin for the purpose of adopting said desired presentation style determining a display page layout and allocating content of said intermediate documents structure in accordance with determined display page style.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding claim 14, Zaharkin teaches a system for transforming a document from a first format to a different second format with respect to independent claim 1 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach:

a system wherein said transformation parameters include at least two of, (a) a page layout size, (b) number of characters per line, (c) number of lines per page, (d) font type and size, (e) heading allocation definition, (f) a scroll or non-scroll selection parameter, and (g) graphics layout definition.

However, Zaharkin teaches:

parameters which specify markup syntax of the DTD and output file (pg. 2 – [0026]) for the purpose of transforming a document from a first format to a different second format in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include transformation parameters including at least two of, (a) a page layout size, (b) number of characters per line, (c) number of lines per page, (d) font type and size, (e) heading allocation definition, (f) a scroll or non-scroll selection parameter, and (g) graphics layout definition for the purpose of transforming a document from a first format to a different second format in accordance with the rules of a browser program in order to properly display the data.

Regarding claim 21, Zaharkin teaches an adaptive processing system with respect to independent claim 19 as discussed above but does not specifically teach:

a system wherein said selected second format is selected from at least one of, (a) different display resolution formats and (b) a scrolling format and (c) a non-scrolling format.

However, Zaharkin teaches:

a computer using operating systems such as Microsoft Windows or Apple MacOS operating systems which are well-known in the art to include (a) different display resolution formats and (b) a scrolling formats and (c) a non-scrolling formats for the purpose of viewing information on a computer screen.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include at least one of, (a) different display resolution formats and (b) a scrolling format and (c) a non-scrolling format for the purpose of viewing information on a computer screen.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 5/23/2005 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-4094. The examiner can normally be reached on 11 am - 7 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PNB

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
8/29/2005